

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of the above amendment, claims 24, 25, 27, 28, and 30 will have been amended and submitted for consideration by the Examiner. Further, claims 26 and 29 remain pending for consideration by the Examiner. In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections of all the claims pending in the present application. Such action is respectfully requested and is now believed to be appropriate and proper.

Initially, Applicants would like to express their appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Advisory Action provided.

Turning to the merits of the action, the Examiner has rejected claims 24-30 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by FEDER (U.S. Patent 5,872,840).

As noted above, claims 24-30 remain pending. Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections based on pending claims 24-30 and will discuss said rejection with respect to the pending claims in the present application as will be set forth hereinbelow.

Applicants' claims 24-26 relate to a server apparatus connected with a transmitting facsimile apparatus and a receiving facsimile apparatus via the Internet. The server apparatus stores capabilities regarding facsimile data that the receiving facsimile can receive. The capabilities information is distinct from the facsimile data. The server apparatus receives facsimile data from the transmitting facsimile apparatus, transforms the received facsimile data into a type of facsimile data that the receiving facsimile apparatus can receive, based on the stored capabilities of the receiving facsimile

apparatus, and transmits the transformed facsimile data to the receiving facsimile apparatus. Claim 30 recites a related method.

In the outstanding Advisory Action, the Examiner asserts that claim 24 does not limit the capabilities that are stored in the memory nor does claim 24 explicitly disclose the relationship between the facsimile device and the respective capabilities. However, claim 24 does limit the capabilities, since the capabilities in claim 24 have to be the capabilities “regarding facsimile data that the receiving facsimile apparatus can receive”. Claim 24 also recites the relationship between the facsimile device and the respective capabilities, since the capabilities in claim 24 have to be ones “regarding facsimile data” and the capabilities have to be ones which “the receiving facsimile apparatus can receive”. In addition, Applicants have clarified claim 24 by reciting “the capabilities being distinct from the facsimile data” without narrowing the scope of claim 24. Applicants also have amended other claims in a similar fashion. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

The Examiner also points out that FEDER teaches of an interface that “de-encapsulates the received data file and separates the file into its components, that is , information relating to the calling and called stations and data related to the message being transmitted. Both components are stored in the memory of the interface”. However, in FEDER, the components stored in the memory are information relating to the calling and called stations and data related to the message being transmitted. The former (information relating to the calling and called stations) is a destination telephone number,

since the specification of FEDER discloses that “the interface retrieves the destination telephone number form memory” (see. column 9, lines 65-67), but the destination telephone number is not “capabilities regarding facsimile data that the receiving facsimile apparatus can receive”, as recited in claim 24, since the received facsimile data can not be transformed into a type of facsimile data that the receiving facsimile apparatus can receive, based on the destination telephone number. The latter (data related to the message being transmitted) corresponds to facsimile data, but the message is not “capabilities regarding facsimile data that the receiving facsimile apparatus can receive”, as recited in claim 24, since the capabilities of claim 24 is distinct from facsimile data. Thus, FEDER does not disclose “the capabilities regarding facsimile data that the receiving facsimile apparatus can receive”, as recited in claim 24.

Therefore, claim 24 and the other pending claims are clearly distinguished from FEDER. It is respectfully submitted that the features recited in Applicants’ claims 24-26 and 30 are not taught in FEDER cited by the Examiner.

Applicant’s claims 27-29 relate to a server apparatus and an Internet facsimile that transmit and receive an e-mail with a predetermined address. The e-mail with the predetermined address indicates the capabilities of the Internet facsimile apparatus to be stored in the memory of the server apparatus.

Regarding to claims 27-29, the Examiner does not point out any pertinent features of the cited reference.

Applicants respectfully note the features of claims 27-29 for reconsideration by the Examiner. The features of claims 27-29 are disclosed on e.g., page 15, lines 14-27 and page 16, lines 1-18 of the specification of the present application. Thus, Applicants respectfully point out that column 8, lines 37-68 of FEDER has no relation to the features of claims 27-29.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the features recited in Applicants' claims 27-29 are also not rendered obvious in FEDER cited by the Examiner.

Accordingly, for each of these reasons, and certainly for all of these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection and an indication of the allowability of all the claims pending in the present application in due course.


SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants have made a sincere effort to place the present application in condition for allowance and believe that they have now done so. Applicants have resubmitted the claims for consideration by the Examiner. With respect to the pending claims, Applicants have pointed out the features thereof and have contrasted the features of the submitted claims with the disclosures of the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicants have provided a clear evidentiary basis supporting the patentability of all claims in the present application and respectfully requests an indication of the allowability of all the claims pending in the present application in due course.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this Response, or the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,  
Yoshihiro HDA et al.

  
Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027

May 14, 2004  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191